



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF
APPLICATION NO.

FILING DATE

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

09/268,254 03/15/99 HOLTSLAG

A PHN-17.049

EXAMINER

WM01/0628

KOVALICK, V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED:

06/28/01

ALGY TAMOSHUNAS
CORPORATE PATENT COUNSEL
U S PHILIPS CORPORATION
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD
TARRYTOWN NY 10591

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/268,254	HOLTSLAG, ANTONIUS H.M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vincent E Kovalick	2673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 1999.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 March 1999 is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 and 4.
- 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2673

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's application as submitted 3/15/99.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. In the specification:

- o Page 6, lines 5-6, teaches "the even row D8 is selected in accordance with Fig. 4A by applying a -1 voltage to select electrodes S5 and a -2 voltage to select electrode S9".

The drawing (Fig. 4A) shows the select electrodes for D8 to be S8 and S9 as opposed to S5 and S9.

- o Page 6, lines 6-8, teaches "the even row D10 is selected in accordance with Fig. 4B by applying a -1 voltage to select electrode S7 and a -2 voltage to the select electrode S11".

The drawing (Fig. 4B) shows the select electrodes for D10 to be S10 and S11 as opposed to S7 and S11.

Art Unit: 2673

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the relationship of the select electrodes applied to the rows as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). The select electrodes driving the rows as described in the specification, page 6, lines 5-8 are not consistent with the select electrodes driving said rows in Figs. 4A and 4B. The inconsistencies are as stated in item 3 hereinabove.

Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipton (U. S. Patent No. 4,562,463).

Relative to claims 1, 4 and 5, Lipton teaches a stereoscopic TV system using sequential display of right and left picture information, it eliminates flicker and spurious temporal parallax effects, an

Art Unit: 2673

Relative to claims 1, 4 and 5, Lipton teaches a stereoscopic TV system using sequential display of right and left picture information, it eliminates flicker and spurious temporal parallax effects, and yields increased brightness (col. 1, lines 8-16; col. 4, lines 17-68 and col. 5, lines 1-40). Lipton further teaches means for displaying a video signal with video lines in a video field period on a plasma display panel (14,48-59); having a first and second display field of display lines, the display lines of the first display field being in an interlace position with respect to the display lines of the second display field the means comprising: alternately selecting several times the first display field only, or the second display field only (col. 4, lines 32-42; col. 13, lines 36-38 and 60-66 and col. 14, lines 28-30), both during a respective time periods which are longer than the video field period (col. 19, lines 17-21), and supply video data signals in conformance with the video lines to the display lines of the selected display field (col. 4, lines 32-38).

The difference between the teaching of Lipton and that of the instant invention is that the instant invention specifies the display device being a plasma display panel (PDP), wherein Lipton teaches the display device being a CRT or solid state display (col. 4, lines 35-37); however, Lipton further teaches that no restriction is placed on the type of display device that can be employed (col. 14, lines 48-49) and specifically identifies a plasma display panels (PDP's) as a display type that would be compatible with the apparatus as taught by Lipton.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the teaching of Lipton teaches the limitations as set forth in claims 1, 4 and 5 of the instant invention.

Art Unit: 2673

Regarding claims 2 and 3, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the method step wherein the number of video lines in a video field period being smaller than or substantially equal to the number of display lines of the first or second display field is well known in the art and in common practice in the display of interlaced video signals; it would have been further obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that in selecting the same (odd or even video field) to be displayed multiple times would require a longer period of time than is required for displaying one of said fields just once.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No. 4,287,528 Levy

U. S. Patent No. 4,286,286 Jurisson et al.

U. S. Patent No. 4,266,240 Levy

Art Unit 2673

Responses

8. Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires to fax a response, (703) 872-9314 may be used for formal communications or for informal or draft communications.

NOTE: a Request for Continuation (Rule 609 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Part II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Inquires

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent E. Kovalick whose telephone number is (703) 306-3020. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala, can be reached on (703) 305-4938.

10. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Vincent E. Kovalick



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600